

*Richard*  
*in Shillit*

SECOND DIVISION  
Between a New  
**Catholick** CONCERNING  
AND A  
**PROTESTANT.**

Shewing why he cannot believe the Doctrine of

*D*  
*221*  
**Transubstantiation.**

Though he do firmly believe the Doctrine

**Of the Trinity.**

[Rev Richard Kinner]

LONDON.

Printed for B. Aymer, at the Three Pigeons  
against the Royal Exchange in Cornhill. 1687.

8/6

IMPRIMATUR.

Decemb. 3.  
1686.

Guil. Needham.

A

# Second Dialogue

Between a new

CATHOLICK CONVERT

A N D A

# Protestant, &c.

A. SIR, I much rejoice to meet you thus happily, and I hope I find you at leisure.

B. I am not onely at leisure, but very much disposed to discourse with you farther of that matter which you commended to my consideration when we were last together.

A. And I hope you have duly considered it; if you have done so, I make no doubt but you are of my mind.

B. I do not find in my self any inclination so prevailing as that which I have towards truth; and you will believe me when I tell you that in matters of this nature I am not likely to be drawn from it by any worldly interest. I have the indifference of a Traveller, and desire nothing but to find the right way to Heaven.

A. This persuasion I have had of you always; and as this disposition to embrace the truth, where ever it is, well becomes an honest mind, so I do not fear but you are by this time convinced, that when you believe the Doctrine of the Holy Trinitie, you cannot reject

the belief of the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; For you remember that this is the question that we disputed on when we met last.

B. You are very right when you say that was the question between us. And I do very well remember

that you used these very words; *As these two*  
*Pag. 2. Doctrines have equal ground from Scripture,*  
*Reason and Tradition; so is there the same*  
*obligation of your receiving the one as well as the other.*  
 I do freely own that I believe the *H. Trinity*, and that  
 I do not believe the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; and  
 therefore do not think my self obliged to believe the  
 one because I believe the other. And, if you please to  
 give me the hearing, I will frankly tell you why I  
 cannot believe the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* true,  
 and then I'll give you my reasons why, though I do  
 believe the *Holy Trinity*, I do not think my self obliged  
 for the same reason to believe your Doctrine of *Transu-*  
*substantiation.*

A. As to the first of these you may I conceive spare  
 your pains. I desire not to hear your reasons against  
 that Doctrine of the Catholick Church. 'Tis the other  
 matter you are most concerned in, viz. to give  
 good reason why you do not believe the one as well as  
 the other. But I give you liberty to proceed in your  
 own way.

B. I shall be very brief as to the first of these, and  
 only touch upon some things that do absolutely hinder  
 me from believing this Doctrine of *Transubstantia-*  
*tion*. Nothing is more certain than that this Doctrine  
 destroys the evidence of Sense, and consequently sub-  
 verts our whole Religion. We cannot be certain of  
 the truth of the Miracles which Jesus did, nor of his  
 Resurrection, if our senses are not to be credited even  
 then when the object of them is at a due distance, and  
 the medium and organ rightly disposed, and all other re-  
 quisites.

quisites in due order. And by the very same reason you believe this Doctrine true I may suspect the rest of your Religion. In a word, it seems to me to be evident that falsehood, and nothing can be more evidently false than manifestly true than this is manifestly false. And you in vain attempt to prove any of your Doctrines from the Bible, when, according to this Doctrine, I may not trust my Eyes, and may as well deny that there is any such place of Scripture which you allege, as you can affirm the truth of this Doctrine; against the evidence of sense. Besides it labours with difficulties and absurdities that are insupportable.

A. But we are not to reject a Doctrine because it is attended with some considerable difficulties, for then we may reject that of the *Holy Trinity*, and of the *Incarnation*, and *Resurrection of our Bodies*. And there are great difficulties in the account of the genealogy of Jesus by St. Matthew and St. Luke, and yet I presume you believe these Doctrines, and do not question the truth of either Evangelist how inconsistent soever they may seem to be one with another.

B. Mistake me not, Sir, I am far from thinking that we are to *reject* those Doctrines which are attended with great difficulties: But yet we are certain that Doctrine cannot be true, which if it were allowed so to be, would subvert the whole Religion, and leave *nothing* certain or true but it self; nor leave us *any* evidence that it self is true.

A. Let me intreat you to speak to the main point, that is, give me your reasons why when you believe the Doctrine of the *Holy Trinity* you should reject this of *Transubstantiation*; for if this be attended with great difficulties, so is the other.

B. This I will readily do, but must tell you again that I do not reject any Doctrine because of the difficulties attending on it.

A. Assign then the reasons why when you do believe the *Trinity*, you deny that Doctrine which hath *Equal Grounds* for it from *Scripture, Reason and Tradition*.

B. Even by no means grant that it hath *Equal Grounds*. And I will therefore give you the reasons which you demand. \* And

Firs. The Doctrine of the *Trinity* is revealed in the Scripture, in this both sides are agreed: The other Doctrine is not revealed, so the *Protestants* with one consent affirm: And indeed those of your Church grant that

*Salomon T.*  
9. tract. 16.

*Bellarmin. de Euchar. l. 2.*  
cap. 23.

thinks his opinion not altogether improbable) that *Transubstantiation* cannot be evidently proved from any express Scripture. Now the Fathers of the Council of *Nice* urge the Text of *H. Writ* against the *Arians*. But the Church of *Rome* maintains their Doctrine upon another bottom, and that is the authority and declaration of the Church.

A. But do we not bring Texts of Scripture for the proof of this Doctrine?

B. That you do frequently, but then the greater and wiser of your Divines will not lay the strels of the cause upon Scripture. I except out of *Consens. vet.* this number Mr. *Sclater of Putney*, who *pag. 20.* is for the literal sense of those words, *This is my Body*, because the *nature of a last Will and Testament* requires it should be so. But, alas! he considers not what follows, where 'tis said in these words of this last Will and Testament, that the *Cup is the New Testament of his Blood*, where he will be forced to acknowledge a figure or two. But he that can prove *Transubstantiation* from the *Rabbies*, may be allowed a greater liberty than other men think fit to take.

A. Have

*A.* Have you any other reason to allege why you do not, when you believe the *Trinity*, believe the *Doctrine* also?

*B.* I have, and having shewed that your *Doctrine* hath not equal ground from *Scripture*, I add,

*Secondly,* That it hath not equal ground from *Reason*. 'Tis certain, and hath been abundantly made good that your *Doctrine* contradicts right Reason; It involves a heap of contradictions: It supposeth a change of substance when the accidents remain, that these accidents should nourish, or destroy: That the same body should be in many places at once, broken and whole at the same time; that a whole body should be in a point; that every wafer should be the whole body, and yet the body be but one. That a thing can be divided into wholes. I forbear to name much more to the same purpose. The *Doctrine* of the *Trinity* is indeed above our reason and comprehension, but you will not say 'tis against it. Besides 'tis revealed, and 'tis reasonable to believe what God says. Besides we are better able to judge the nature of bodies ( upon which account we reject your *Doctrine* as manifestly false ) than of the spiritual and incomprehensible nature of God. We reject not what our reason does not comprehend. But shall we therefore believe what is a contradiction to all the reason of mankind? And because we do not comprehend the sublime nature of God, may we not rely upon our senses when they are employed on their proper objects ?

*A.* Have you any other reason why you reject *Transubstantiation*, when you believe the *Trinity*?

*B.* Having shewed that your *Doctrine* hath not Equal Ground from *Scripture* and *Reason*, I add, that it hath not,

*Thirdly,* Equal ground from *Authority*. Indeed you produced none at all, and therefore I need not cite any in

Tradition, and that there are equal grounds for both the *Holy Trinity*. It will be hard to reflect on this concession with what you informed a little ago, that these two Doctrines have *Equal ground from Tradition*. But he that believes the Doctrine it self need not people to say, that not half so much as yet *Equal ground*. 'Tis true you pretend to prove a good redon with the Fathers and not half so much as that one as in the other. Because *Transubstantiation* hath not been a Doctrine so long in dispute, and 'tis not necessary for men to argue unquestionable truths. For many believe it hath not been so long in dispute; no such thing being heard of in the primitive and best times. And 'tis easier to suppose it an unquestionable truth than to prove it to have been professed at all. But this is to beg and not to prove the question.

I will add no more reasons, though I might easily do it, because I am for brevity as well as you. I have abundantly shewed that these two Doctrines have not Equal ground from Scripture, Reason and Tradition, and that there is not the same obligation to receive one as the other.

And thus, Sir, though I cannot acquiesce in what you say, yet I heartily thank you for your good Prayer and beg you would joyn with me in repeating it in behalf of all Christians. *God give us his Holy Spirit to instruct us.*

**F I N I S.**

